arXiv:1403.0048v2 [stat.ME] 6 Nov 2015

Model-Free Sure Screening via Maximum Correlation

Qiming Huang and Yu Zhu*

Abstract

For screening features in an ultrahigh-dimensional setting, we develop a maximum correlation-based sure independence screening (MC-SIS) procedure, and show that MC-SIS possesses the sure screen property without imposing model or distributional assumptions on the response and predictor variables. MC-SIS is a model-free method as in contrast with some other existing model-based sure independence screening methods in the literature. Simulation examples and a real data application are used to demonstrate the performance of MC-SIS as well as to compare MC-SIS with other existing sure screening methods. The results show that MC-SIS can outperform those methods when their model assumptions are violated, and remain competitive when the model assumptions are satisfied.

Key Words: B-spline; Distance correlation; Optimal transformation; Sure screening property; Variable selection.

*Qiming Huang is Ph.D candidate (e-mail: hqm@purdue.edu) and Yu Zhu is Professor (e-mail: yuzhu@purdue.edu), Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907. The authors would like to thank all authors of Li, Zhong and Zhu (2012) for the clarification of their technical proofs and all authors of Fan, Feng and Song (2011) for providing the R codes used in their paper.

1 Introduction

With rapid development of modern technology, various types of high-dimensional data are collected in a variety of areas such as next-generation sequencing and biomedical imaging data in bioinformatics, high-frequency time series data in quantitative finance, and spatial-temporal data in environmental studies. In those types of high-dimensional data, the number of variables *p* can be much larger than the sample size *n*, which is referred to the 'large p small n' scenario. To deal with this scenario, a commonly adopted approach is to impose the sparsity assumption that the number of important variables is small relative to p. Based on the sparsity assumption, a variety of regularization procedures have been proposed for high-dimensional regression analysis such as the lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), the smoothly clipped absolute deviation method (Fan and Li, 2001), and elastic net (Zou and Hastie, 2005). All these methods work when p is moderate. However, when applied to analyze ultrahigh-dimensional data where dimensionality grows exponentially with sample size (e.g., $p = \exp(n^{\alpha})$ with $\alpha > 0$), their performances will deteriorate in terms of computational expediency, statistical accuracy and algorithmic stability (Fan et al., 2009). To address the challenges of ultrahigh dimensionality, a number of marginal screening procedures have been proposed under different model assumptions. They all share the same goal that is to reduce dimensionality from ultrahigh to high while retaining all truly important variables. When a screening procedure achieves this goal, it is said to have the sure screening property in the literature.

Fan and Lv (2008) proposed to use Pearson correlation for feature screening and showed that the resulting procedure possesses the sure screening property under the linear model assumption. They refer to the procedure as the Sure Independence Screening (SIS) procedure. Fan and Song (2010) extended SIS from linear models to generalized linear models by using maximum marginal likelihood values. Fan et al. (2011) developed a Nonparametric Independence Screening (NIS) procedure and proved that NIS has the sure screening

property under the additive model. Li et al. (2012) proposed to use distance correlation to rank the predictor variables, and showed that the resulting procedure, denoted as DC-SIS, has the sure screening property without imposing any specific model assumption. Compared with the other screening procedures discussed previously, DC-SIS is thus model-free. Distance correlation was introduced in Szekely et al. (2007), which uses joint and marginal characteristic functions to measure the dependence between two random variables.

From the review above, it is clear that the standard approach to developing a valid screening procedure consists of two steps. First, a proper dependence measure between the response and predictor variables needs to be defined and further used to rank-order all the predictor variables; and second, the sure screening property needs to be established for the screening procedure based on the dependence measure. The screening methods discussed in the previous paragraph differ from each other in these two steps. For example, SIS uses Pearson correlation as the dependence measure and possesses the sure screening property under linear models, whereas NIS uses the goodness of fit measure of the nonparametric regression between the response and predictor variable as the dependence measure and possesses the sure screening property under additive models.

For the purpose of screening in an ultrahigh dimensional setting, we argue that an effective screening procedure should employ a sensitive dependence measure and satisfy the sure screening requirement without model specifications. The goal of screening is not to precisely select the true predictors, instead, it is to reduce the number of predictor variables from ultrahigh to high while retaining the true predictor variables. Therefore, false positives or selections can be tolerated to a large degree, and sensitive dependence measures are more preferred than insensitive measures. In ultrahigh dimensional data, there usually does not exist information about the relationship between the response and predictor variables, and it is extremely difficult to explore the possible relationship due to the presence of a large number of predictors. Therefore, model assumptions should be avoided

as much as possible in ultrahigh dimensional screening, and we should prefer screening procedures that possess the sure screening property without model specifications. In other words, model-free sure screening procedures are more preferable. Among the existing screening procedures discussed previously, only DC-SIS does not require restrictive model assumption and therefore is model-free. However, the distance correlation measure used by DC-SIS may not be sensitive especially when sample size is small, because empirical characteristic functions are employed to estimate distance correlations.

A more sensitive dependence measure between the response and a predictor variable is maximum correlation, which was originally proposed by Gebelein (1941) and studied by Rényi (1959) as a general dependence measure between two random variables. Rényi (1959) gave a list of seven fundamental properties a reasonable dependence measure must have, and maximum correlation is one of a few measures that satisfy this requirement. The definition and estimation of maximum correlation involve maximizations over functions (see Section 2.1), and thus it is fairly sensitive even when sample size is small. Recently, there have been some revived interests in using maximum correlation as a proper dependence measure in high-dimensional data analysis (Bickel and Xu, 2009; Hall and Miller, 2011; Reshef et al., 2011; Speed, 2011).

In this paper, we propose to use maximum correlation as a dependence measure for ultrahigh dimensional screening, and prove that the resulting procedure has the sure screening property without imposing model specifications (see Theorem 1 in Section 2.4). We adopt the B-spline functions-based estimation method (Burman, 1991) to estimate maximum correlation. We refer to our proposed procedure as the maximum correlation-based sure independence screening procedure, or in short, the MC-SIS procedure. Numerical results show that MC-SIS is competitive to other existing model-based screening procedures, and is more sensitive and robust than DC-SIS when sample size is small or the distributions of the predictor variables have heavy tails.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce maximum correlation and the B-spline functions-based method for estimating maximum correlation, propose the MC-SIS procedure, and establish the sure screening property for MC-SIS. In Section 3, we develop a three-step procedure for selecting tuning parameters for MC-SIS in practice. Section 4 presents results from simulation study and a real life screening application. Section 5 concludes the paper with additional remarks and future research. The proofs of the theorems are given in the Appendix.

2 Independence Screening via Maximum Correlation

2.1 Maximum correlation and optimal transformation

Let Y denote the response variable and $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_p)$ be the vector of predictor variables. We assume the supports of Y and X_j $(j = 1, \ldots, p)$ are compact, and they are further assumed to be [0,1] without loss of generality. For any given j, consider a pair of random variables (X_j, Y). The maximum correlation coefficient between X_j and Y, denoted as ρ_j^*, is defined as follows.

$$\rho_j^*(X_j, Y) = \sup_{\theta,\phi}\{\rho\left(\theta(Y), \phi(X_j)\right) : 0 < E\{\theta^2(Y)\} < \infty, 0 < E\{\phi^2(X_j)\} < \infty\}, \quad (1)$$

where ρ is the Pearson correlation, and θ and ϕ are Borel-measurable functions of Y and X_j. We further denote θ_j^* and ϕ_j^* as the optimal transformations that attain the maximum correlation.

Maximum correlation coefficient enjoys the following properties (Rényi, 1959): (a) $0 \leq \rho_j^*(X_j, Y) \leq 1$; (b) $\rho_j^*(X_j, Y) = 0$ if and only if X_j and Y are independent; (c) $\rho_j^*(X_j, Y) = 1$ if there exist Borel-measurable functions θ^* and ϕ^* such that $\theta^*(Y) =$

$\phi^*(X_j)$; and (d) if X_j and Y are jointly Gaussian, then $\rho_j^*(X_j, Y) = |\rho(X_j, Y)|$. Some other properties of maximum correlation coefficient are discussed in Szekely and Mori (1985), Dembo et al. (2001), Bryc and Dembo (2005), and Yu (2008). Due to Property (d), it is clear that maximum correlation is a natural extension of Pearson correlation. Note that Pearson correlation does not possess Properties (b) and (c). For property (c), there are cases that Pearson correlation coefficient can be as low as zero when Y is functionally determined by X_j. For example, if $Y = X_1^2$ where $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the Pearson correlation between Y and X_1 is zero, whereas the maximum correlation is one. Therefore, maximum correlation is a more proper measure of the dependence between two random variables than Pearson correlation.

Rényi (1959) established the existence of maximum correlation under certain sufficient conditions, and a different set of sufficient conditions are given in Breiman and Friedman (1985). Breiman and Friedman (1985) also showed that optimal transformations θ_j^* and ϕ_j^* can be obtained via the following minimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta_j, \phi_j \in L_2(P)} \quad & e_j^2 = E[\{\theta_j(Y) - \phi_j(X_j)\}^2], \\ \text{subject to} \quad & E\{\theta_j(Y)\} = E\{\phi_j(X_j)\} = 0; \\ & E\{\theta_j^2(Y)\} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, *P* denotes the joint distribution of (X_j,Y) and $L_2(P)$ is the class of square integrable functions under the measure *P*. Let e_j^{*2} be the minimum of e_j^2. Breiman and Friedman (1985) derived two critical connections between e_j^{*2}, squared maximum correlation ρ_j^{*2}, and optimal transformation ϕ_j^*, which we state as *Fact 0* below.

Fact 0.

$$e_j^{*2} = 1 - \rho_j^{*2}; \tag{3a}$$

$$E(\phi_j^{*2}) = \rho_j^{*2}. \tag{3b}$$

Fact 0 suggests that the minimization problem (2) is equivalent to the optimization problem (1). Furthermore, the squared maximum correlation coefficient is equal to the expectation of the squared optimal transformation ϕ_j^*.

Various algorithms have been proposed in the literature to compute maximum correlation, including Alternating Conditional Expectations (ACE) in Breiman and Friedman (1985), B-spline approximation in Burman (1991), and polynomial approximation in Bickel and Xu (2009) and Hall and Miller (2011). Equation (3b) indicates that maximum correlation coefficient ρ_j^* can be calculated through the optimal transformation ϕ_j^*. In this paper, we apply Burman's approach to first estimate ϕ_j^*, and then estimate ρ_j^*, which will be further used in screening.

2.2 B-spline estimation of optimal transformations

Let $\mathcal{S}_n$ be the space of polynomial splines of degree $\ell \geq 1$ and $\{B_{jm}, m = 1, \ldots, d_n\}$ denote a normalized B-spline basis with $||B_{jm}||_{sup} \leq 1$, where $||\cdot||_{sup}$ is the sup-norm. We have $\theta_{nj}(Y) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{B}_j(Y)$, $\phi_{nj}(X_j) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{B}_j(X_j)$ for any $\theta_{nj}(Y), \phi_{nj}(X_j) \in \mathcal{S}_n$, where $\mathbf{B}_j(\cdot) = (B_{j1}(\cdot), \ldots, B_{jd_n}(\cdot))^T$ denotes the vector of d_n basis functions. Additionally, we let k be the number of knots where $k = d_n - \ell$. The population version of B-spline approximation to the minimization problem (2) can be written as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta_{nj}, \phi_{nj} \in \mathcal{S}_n} \quad & E[\{\theta_{nj}(Y) - \phi_{nj}(X_j)\}^2], \\ \text{subject to} \quad & E\{\theta_{nj}(Y)\} = E\{\phi_{nj}(X_j)\} = 0; \\ & E\{\theta_{nj}^2(Y)\} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Burman (1991) applied a technique to remove the first constraint $E\{\theta_{nj}(Y)\} = E\{\phi_{nj}(X_j)\} = 0$ in the optimization problem above as follows. First, let $\mathbf{z}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_{d_n - 1}$

($\mathbf{z}_i = (z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{id_n})^T$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d_n - 1$) be d_n-dimensional vectors which are orthogonal to each other, orthogonal to the vector of 1's and $\mathbf{z}_i^T \mathbf{z}_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d_n - 1$. Second, obtain matrix $\mathbf{D}_j$ with the (s, m)-entry $\mathbf{D}_{j,sm} = z_{sm}/(k b_{jm})$ where $b_{jm} = E\{B_{jm}(X_j)\}$, for $s = 1, \ldots, d_n - 1$ and $m = 1, \ldots, d_n$. Third, let $\phi_{nj}(X_j) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)$ where $\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j) = \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{B}_j(X_j)$. With this construction, it is easy to verify that $E\{\phi_{nj}(X_j)\} = 0$, and the minimization of $E[\{\theta_{nj}(Y) - \phi_{nj}(X_j)\}^2]$ subject to $E\{\theta_{nj}^2(Y)\} = 1$ ensures that $E\{\theta_{nj}(Y)\} = 0$. Burman (1991) showed the equivalence between the optimization problem (4) and the one stated below.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta_{nj}, \phi_{nj} \in \mathcal{S}_n} \quad & E[\{\theta_{nj}(Y) - \phi_{nj}(X_j)\}^2], \\ \text{subject to} \quad & E\{\theta_{nj}^2(Y)\} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For fixed $\theta_{nj}(Y)$ (i.e. fixed $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$), the minimizer of (5) with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j$ and $\phi_{nj}(X_j)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\eta}_j &= [E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}]^{-1} E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j, \\ \phi_{nj}(X_j) &= \boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)[E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}]^{-1} E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

By plugging $\phi_{nj}(X_j)$ back in (5), we obtain the following maximization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d_n}} \quad & \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}[E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}]^{-1} E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Following the notation in Burman (1991), we denote

$$\mathbf{A}_{j00} = E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}, \qquad \mathbf{A}_{jXX} = E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\},$$
$$\mathbf{A}_{jX0} = E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A}_{j0X} = \mathbf{A}_{jX0}^T.$$

It is clear that (7) is a generalized eigenvalue problem, which can be solved by the largest eigenvalue and its corresponding eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}_{j0X}\mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{jX0}\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}$. We denote

the largest eigenvalue by λ_{j1}^*, which is equal to $||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}_{j0X}\mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{jX0}\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}||$, where $||\cdot||$ is the operator norm, and further denote the corresponding eigenvector by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$. Let $\phi_{nj}^*(X_j) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)[E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}]^{-1}E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$. ϕ_{nj}^* can be considered the spline approximation to the optimal transformation ϕ_j^* defined previously. Note that the target function in (7) is $E(\phi_{nj}^{*2})$, and we also have $E(\phi_{nj}^{*2}) = \lambda_{j1}^*$.

Given the data $\{Y_u\}_{u=1}^n$ and $\{X_{uj}\}_{u=1}^n$, we estimate $\mathbf{A}_{j00}$, $\mathbf{A}_{jXX}$, $\mathbf{A}_{jX0}$, and $\mathbf{A}_{j0X}$ as follows.

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}} = n^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^n \mathbf{B}_j(Y_u)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y_u), \qquad \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}} = n^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^n \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_j(X_{uj})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_j^T(X_{uj}),$$
$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jX0}} = n^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^n \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_j(X_{uj})\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y_u), \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jX0}}^T,$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_j(X_{uj}) = \widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\mathbf{B}_j(X_{uj})$, the (s,m)-entry of $\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}$ is $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{j,sm} = z_{sm}/(k\widehat{b_{jm}})$, and $\widehat{b_{jm}} = n^{-1}\sum_{u=1}^n B_{jm}(X_{uj})$, for $s = 1,\ldots,d_n-1$ and $m = 1,\ldots,d_n$. Then, λ_{j1}^* is estimated by

$$\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} = ||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}^T\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}||,$$

and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$ is estimated by the eigenvector of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}^T\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}$ corresponding to $\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*}$, which we denote as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*}$. Therefore, the optimal transformation of Y is estimated by $\widehat{\theta_{nj}^*} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*}^T B_j(Y)$. Furthermore, based on (6), the optimal transformation of X_j can be obtained by $\widehat{\phi_{nj}^*} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^*}^T\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)$ with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^*} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jX0}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*}$.

Based on the two relationships (i) $E(\phi_j^{*2}) = (\rho_j^*)^2$ and (ii) $E(\phi_{nj}^{*2}) = \lambda_{j1}^*$, and the fact that ϕ_{nj}^* is the optimal spline approximation to ϕ_j^*, we propose to screen important variables using the magnitudes of $\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*}$ for $1 \le j \le p$.

2.3 MC-SIS procedure

Let ν_n be a pre-specified threshold, and $\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}$ the collection of selected important variables. Then our proposed screening procedure can be defined as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}} = \{1 \leq j \leq p \colon \widehat{\lambda^*_{j1}} \geq \nu_n\}. \tag{8}$$

$[a]$ denotes the integer part of a. Since $\widehat{\lambda^*_{j1}}$ is the estimate of λ^*_{j1}, which is an approximation to the squared maximum correlation coefficient ρ^{*2}_j, we refer to the procedure as the MC-SIS procedure. The sure screening property of the procedure will be discussed in next section.

2.4 Sure Screening Property

Adopting notations from Li et al. (2012), we use $F(Y|\mathbf{X})$ to denote the conditional distribution of Y given $\mathbf{X}$ and Ψ_Y the support for Y. We define $\mathcal{D} = \{j : F(y|\mathbf{X})$ functionally depends on $X_j\}$, and $\mathcal{I} = \{j : F(y|\mathbf{X})$ does not functionally depends on $X_j\}$. Let $\mathbf{X}_\mathcal{D} = \{X_j : j \in \mathcal{D}\}$ and $\mathbf{X}_\mathcal{I} = \{X_j : j \in \mathcal{I}\}$, which are referred to the *active* and *inactive sets*, respectively. Furthermore, we refer the variables in the active set and inactive set as *active predictor variables* and *inactive predictor variables*, respectively. Ideally, the goal of a screening procedure is to retain $\mathcal{D}$ after screening, which is referred to as the sure screening property. We have established the sure screening property of the MC-SIS procedure under certain conditions. Before stating the theorem, we first list the conditions below.

(C1) If the transformations θ_j and ϕ_j with zero means and finite variances satisfy

$$\theta_j(Y) + \phi_j(X_j) = 0 \text{ a.s., then each of them is zero a.s.}$$

(C2) The conditional expectation operators $E\{\phi_j(X_j) \mid Y\} : H_2(X_j) \to H_2(Y)$ and $E\{\theta_j(Y) \mid X_j\} : H_2(Y) \to H_2(X_j)$ are all compact operators. $H_2(Y)$ and $H_2(X_j)$ are Hilbert spaces of all measurable functions with zero mean, finite variance and usual inner product.

(C3) The optimal transformations $\{\theta_j^*, \phi_j^*\}_{j=1}^p$ belong to a class of functions $\mathcal{F}$, whose *r*th derivative $f^{(r)}$ exists and is Lipschitz of order α_1, that is, $\mathcal{F} = \{f : |f^{(r)}(s) - f^{(r)}(t)| \leq K|s-t|^{\alpha_1}$ for all $s, t\}$ for some positive constant *K*, where *r* is a nonnegative integer and $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1]$ such that $d = r + \alpha_1 > 0.5$.

(C4) The joint density of Y and X_j $(j = 1, \ldots, p)$ is bounded and the marginal densities of Y and X_j are bounded away from zero.

(C6) There exist positive constant C_1 and constant $\xi \in (0, 1)$ such that $d_n^{-d-1} \leq c_1(1 - \xi)n^{-2\kappa}/C_1$.

Conditions (C1) and (C2) are adopted from Breiman and Friedman (1985), which ensure that the optimal transformations exist. Conditions (C3) and (C4) are from Burman (1991), but modified for our two-variable scenario. Condition (C5) above is similar to Condition 3 in Fan and Lv (2008), Condition C in Fan et al. (2011), and Condition (C2) in Li et al. (2012), which all require that the dependence between the response and active predictor variables cannot be too weak. We note that this condition is necessary, since a marginal screening procedure will fail when the marginal dependence between the response and an active predictor variable is too weak.

The following lemma shows that the maximum correlations achieved by B-spline-based transformations are at the same level as the original maximum correlations.

Lemma 1. *Under conditions (C3) – (C6), we have* $\min_{j \in \mathcal{D}} \lambda_{j1}^* \geq c_1 \xi d_n n^{-2\kappa}$.

Based on condition (C1) – (C6), we establish the following sure screening properties

for MC-SIS.

Theorem 1. *(a) Under conditions (C1) – (C4), for any $c_2 > 0$, there exist positive constants c_3 and c_4 such that*

$$P(\max_{1\le j\le p} |\widehat{\lambda^*_{j1}} - \lambda^*_{j1}| \ge c_2 d_n n^{-2\kappa}) \le \mathcal{O}\left(p\zeta(d_n, n)\right). \tag{9}$$

where $\zeta(d_n, n) = d_n^2 \exp(-c_3 n^{1-4\kappa} d_n^{-4}) + d_n \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-7})$.

(b) Additionally, if conditions (C5) and (C6) hold, by taking $\nu_n = c_5 d_n n^{-\kappa}$ with $c_5 \le c_1\xi/2$, we have that

$$P(\mathcal{D} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}) \ge 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(s\zeta(d_n, n)\right), \tag{10}$$

where s is the cardinality of $\mathcal{D}$.

Note that Theorem 1 is stated for fixed number of predictor variables p. In fact, the same theorem holds for divergent number of predictor variables p_n. As long as $p_n\zeta(d_n, n)$ goes to zero asymptotically, MC-SIS can possess the sure screening property. And we remark that the number of basis functions d_n affects the final performance of MC-SIS. To obtain the sure screening property, an upper bound of d_n is $o(n^{1/7})$. Since d_n is determined by the choices of the degree of B-spline basis functions and the number of knots, different combinations of degree and the number of knots can lead to different screening results. Additionally, knots placement can further affect the behavior of B-spline functions, and in practice, knots are usually equally spaced or placed at sample quantiles. In next section, we will propose a data-driven three-step procedure for determine d_n for MC-SIS in practice. The optimal choice of d_n and knots placement are beyond the scope of this paper and can be an interesting topic for future research.

The sure screening property from Theorem 1 guarantees that MC-SIS retains the active set. The size of the selected set can be much larger than the size of the active set. Therefore,

it is of interest to assess the size of the selected set, similar to Fan et al. (2011). The next theorem is such a result for MC-SIS.

Theorem 2. *Under Conditions (C1) – (C6), we have that for any $\nu_n = c_5 d_n n^{-\kappa}$, there exist positive constants c_3 and c_4 such that*

$$P[|\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}| \leq \mathcal{O}\{n^{2\kappa}\lambda_{max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})\}] \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(p_n \zeta(d_n, n)\right), \tag{11}$$

where $|\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}|$ is the cardinality of $\widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}$, , $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}\boldsymbol{\psi}^T\}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\boldsymbol{\psi}_1^T, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\psi}_{p_n}^T)^T$, p_n is the divergent number of predictor variables, and $\zeta(d_n, n)$ is defined in Theorem 1 .

From Theorem 2, we have that when $\lambda_{max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{\tau})$, the cardinality of the selected set by MC-SIS will be of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{2\kappa+\tau})$. Thus, by applying MC-SIS, we can reduce dimensionality from the original exponential order to a polynomial order, while retaining the entire active set.

3 Tuning Parameter Selection

4 Numerical Results

We illustrate the MC-SIS procedure by studying its performance under different model settings and distributional assumptions of the predictor variables. For all examples, we compare MC-SIS with SIS, NIS, and DC-SIS. As mentioned at the end of Section 2.1, the ACE algorithm in Breiman and Friedman (1985) can also be used to calculate maximum correlation coefficient. Therefore, the ACE algorithm can also be used to perform maximum correlation-based screening, and we refer to the resulting procedure as the ACE-based MC-SIS procedure. We also include the ACE-based MC-SIS procedure in our simulation

study. To avoid confusion, we refer to our proposed procedure as the B-spline-based MC-SIS procedure in this section. For each simulation example, we set $p = 1000$ and choose $n \in \{200, 300, 400\}$.

Following Fan and Lv (2008) and Fan et al. (2011), we measure the effectiveness of MC-SIS using minimum model size (MMS) and robust estimate of its standard deviation (RSD). MMS is defined as the minimum number of selected variables, i.e., the size of the selected set, that is required to include the entire active set. RSD is defined as IQR/1.34, where IQR is the interquartile range. When constructing B-spline basis functions,

Example 1. *(1.a):* $Y = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{*T}\mathbf{X} + \varepsilon$*, with the first s components of* $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ *taking values* ± 1 *alternatively and the remaining being 0, where* $s = 3, 6$ *or* 12*;* X_k *are independent and identically distributed as* $N(0,1)$ *for* $1 \le k \le 950$*;* $X_k = \sum_{j=1}^{s} X_j (-1)^{j+1}/5 + (1 - s\varepsilon_k/25)^{1/2}$ *where* ε_k *are independent and identically distributed as* $N(0,1)$ *for* $k = 951, \ldots, 1000$*; and* $\varepsilon \sim N(0,3)$*. Here,* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, \ldots, s\}$.

(1.b): $Y = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + \varepsilon$*, where* X_k *are independent and identically distributed as* $N(0,1)$ *for* $k = 1$*, and* $3 \le k \le 1000$*;* $X_2 = \frac{1}{3}X_1^3 + \tilde{\varepsilon}$*, and* $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sim N(0,1)$*; and* $\varepsilon \sim N(0,3)$*. Here,* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

The first example is from Fan et al. (2011) and the simulation results are presented in Table 1. Under model (1.a), SIS demonstrates the best performance across all cases, which is expected since SIS is specifically developed for linear models. Under the models (1.a) with $s = 3$ or 6, when $n = 200$, MC-SIS under-performs all other methods. However, when sample size increases to 300 or 400, MC-SIS becomes comparable to others. For the case with $s = 12$, MC-SIS under-performs other methods for all choices of n. The cause for the relatively poor performance of MC-SIS is due to the weak signal. With $s = 12$, it requires more samples for MC-SIS to estimate maximum correlation coefficient, without taking advantages of linearity assumptions.

Table 1: MMS and RSD (in parenthesis) for Example 1

Model	n	SIS	NIS	DC-SIS	MC-SIS (ACE)	MC-SIS (B-spline)
1.a	200	*5.8(3.0)*	6.4(3.0)	6.8(3.2)	11.9(7.7)	36.6(20.7)
(s = 3)	300	*4.6(0.9)*	4.9(1.5)	5.1(1.5)	5.9(3.0)	15.0(6.7)
	400	*3.3(0.0)*	3.4(0.0)	3.6(0.8)	3.6(0.8)	6.8(3.7)
1.a	200	*57.4(2.4)*	68.7(9.7)	60.2(3.7)	140.5(60.8)	175.0(50.2)
(s = 6)	300	*56.0(0.0)*	58.2(0.2)	57.1(0.0)	67.4(5.2)	94.7(27.8)
	400	*55.8(0.0)*	55.9(0.0)	55.9(0.0)	56.8(0.8)	68.0(9.0)
1.a	200	*119.4(42.9)*	250.6(133.2)	195.2(55.8)	484.6(181.9)	500.4(197.4)
(s = 12)	300	*73.4(7.5)*	120.6(35.3)	80.3(10.6)	211.2(108.4)	248.9(103.9)
	400	*64.5(0.8)*	82.21(6.7)	69.7(1.5)	118.2(90.8)	178.2(41.2)
1.b	200	443.6(455.2)	*26.5(6.7)*	136.1(113.4)	56.8(32.8)	115.7(84.7)
	300	394.5(379.7)	*7.3(0.0)*	59.9(48.5)	21.9(5.4)	51.9(27.4)
	400	410.0(361.2)	*3.2(0.0)*	41.1(36.8)	5.6(0.8)	20.0(4.7)

In model (1.b), SIS fails as there exists a nonlinear relationship between X_1 and X_2. NIS demonstrates the best performance as NIS is designed for dealing with nonparametric additive models. The ACE-based MC-SIS procedure demonstrates the second best performance. The B-spline-based MC-SIS procedure performs better than DC-SIS.

Example 2. *(2.a):* $Y = X_1X_2 + X_3X_4 + \varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$*; (2.b):* $Y = X_1^2 + X_2^3 + X_3^2X_4 + \varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$*; (2.c):* $Y = X_1 \sin(X_2) + X_2 \sin(X_1) + \varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2\}$*; (2.d):* $Y = X_1 \exp(X_2) + \varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2\}$*; (2.e):* $Y = X_1 \log(|c_0 + X_2|) + \varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2\}$*; (2.f):* $Y = X_1/(c_0+X_2)+\varepsilon$*;* $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2\}$*. Here* $X_1, \ldots, X_{1000}$ *and* ϵ *are generated independently from* $N(0, 1)$*, and* $c_0 = 10^{-4}$*.*

The eight models considered in this example are non-additive, and the simulation results are presented in Table 2. Due to the presence of non-additive structures, we notice that SIS and NIS fail in all models, and increasing sample size does not help improve the performances of SIS and NIS for most models. Both MC-SIS and DC-SIS work well in this example, but MC-SIS outperforms DC-SIS for almost all the models in terms of MMS. Even when the sample size is as small as 200, MC-SIS can effectively retain the active set under models (2.c), (2.e) and (2.f). This example demonstrates the advantages of MC-

Table 2: MMS and RSD (in parenthesis) for Example 2

Model	n	SIS	NIS	DC-SIS	MC-SIS (ACE)	MC-SIS (B-spline)
2.a	200	709.3(239.0)	651.5(285.5)	440.6(231.2)	*248.7(242.5)*	324.3(228.2)
	300	724.1(194.6)	631.2(251.7)	350.5(186.0)	*117.8(88.3)*	197.8(152.6)
	400	795.3(194.8)	636.5(256.3)	280.0(148.9)	*59.3(26.1)*	118.2(92.2)
2.b	200	617.5(308.2)	300.5(298.7)	186.5(132.5)	*104.2(103.0)*	176.5(135.1)
	300	608.5(305.0)	277.8(250.0)	163.6(150.2)	*78.4(44.6)*	125.1(71.6)
	400	597.4(291.6)	262.0(228.9)	114.7(103.7)	*54.9(13.9)*	63.8(32.1)
2.c	200	574.5(352.2)	511.7(389.0)	113.6(80.2)	*18.1(2.24)*	30.9(15.1)
	300	616.4(342.2)	521.8(321.6)	51.0(30.0)	*8.4(0.8)*	9.6(3.2)
	400	622.4(306.3)	547.8(337.9)	21.4(14.0)	13.0(0.0)	*4.8(2.2)*
2.d	200	536.5(285.1)	181.8(168.5)	*2.0(0.0)*	2.3(0.8)	9.7(3.2)
	300	268.6(307.1)	172.8(190.9)	*2.0(0.0)*	*2.0(0.0)*	6.4(3.0)
	400	272.1(331.0)	176.3(178.7)	*2.0(0.0)*	*2.0(0.0)*	4.7(2.2)
2.e	200	580.2(152.8)	512.2(405.6)	191.0(152.8)	55.1(20.3)	*26.6(14.2)*
	300	588.7(299.4)	641.0(295.3)	107.1(70.3)	40.7(1.5)	*11.5(4.5)*
	400	602.1(258.4)	568.0(311.9)	66.2(44.6)	19.8(0.0)	*7.6(3.7)*
2.f	200	928.8(59.3)	654.5(417.9)	140.5(123.5)	*30.0(9.9)*	40.8(11.9)
	300	936.7(37.7)	768.8(292.0)	61.6(46.6)	23.4(2.2)	*17.5(6.0)*
	400	942.0(39.9)	821.7(175.2)	60.9(22.8)	17.8(0.8)	*12.6(3.7)*

SIS and DC-SIS over SIS and NIS for non-additive models as well as the effectiveness of MC-SIS over DC-SIS.

Example 3. *The models considered in this example are modifications of the models considered in Example 2. First, the error term ϵ in each original model is removed; and second, the predictor variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_p$ are drawn independently from $Cauchy(0, 1)$ instead of $N(0, 1)$. The resulting models are denoted as (3.a)-(3.f), correspondingly. Simulation results based on these models are presented in Table 3.*

Intuitively, the absence of the error terms in the models is expected to help the screening methods, but the use of heavy-tailed distributions for the predictor variables is expected to hinder the methods. The exact performance of a screening method in this example depends on the trade-off between those two changes. Comparing Table 3 with Table 2, we can see that the performances of SIS and NIS have improved, though they are still far from

Table 3: MMS and RSD (in parenthesis) for Example 3

Model	n	SIS	NIS	DC-SIS	MC-SIS (ACE)	MC-SIS (B-spline)
3.a	200	338.8(284.3)	296.6(175.4)	90.3(54.3)	124.1(39.2)	*78.7(26.5)*
	300	310.2(241.6)	310.8(253.7)	64.6(32.5)	72.2(14.7)	*44.6(9.1)*
	400	273.3(242.4)	303.1(260.6)	48.3(29.9)	*41.5(7.1)*	*34.5(6.0)*
3.b	200	617.5(305.2)	617.5(256.7)	478.9(286.6)	117.8(36.6)	*79.6(56.0)*
	300	665.8(348.3)	689.2(256.2)	511.2(258.8)	72.0(8.6)	*42.1(6.2)*
	400	619.8(297.0)	696.8(250.0)	507.8(265.1)	32.7(6.7)	*32.2(6.9)*
3.c	200	136.5(80.2)	106.6(70.7)	23.7(12.7)	*11.9(5.2)*	22.8(6.9)
	300	116.1(82.1)	90.1(56.2)	13.4(6.3)	*8.7(4.5)*	17.3(6.2)
	400	90.4(36.0)	67.9(39.2)	9.9(4.7)	*7.3(3.2)*	13.7(5.2)
3.d	200	409.5(367.0)	434.8(409.0)	412.3(401.1)	*15.4(3.7)*	19.3(6.0)
	300	485.1(320.0)	486.7(411.0)	493.8(397.0)	*7.8(2.4)*	14.1(3.7)
	400	460.8(342.0)	493.4(360.1)	480.7(407.3)	12.5(0.0)	*11.5(3.7)*
3.e	200	252.2(193.8)	250.2(228.5)	124.0(99.1)	55.8(11.4)	*39.6(8.2)*
	300	332.9(332.7)	340.0(289.0)	188.7(120.9)	42.9(4.5)	*36.1(7.5)*
	400	314.3(315.5)	334.6(308.6)	121.1(98.0)	37.8(4.1)	*22.8(6.0)*
3.f	200	779.8(172.0)	737.0(244.2)	507.7(249.6)	37.5(6.9)	*27.4(6.0)*
	300	808.4(149.8)	855.7(120.9)	498.6(336.0)	28.7(4.5)	*20.7(5.2)*
	400	806.7(149.1)	837.6(143.5)	432.6(281.9)	34.3(3.7)	*17.3(3.9)*

being satisfactory. The performance of DC-SIS has improved in models (3.a) and (3.c), but has much deteriorated in the other models, which indicates that DC-SIS is susceptible to heavy-tailed distributions. In the presence of heavy tails, Condition (C1) in Li et al. (2012) is violated, and DC-SIS may not have the sure screening property. The performances of ACE-based and B-spline-based MC-SIS are better over DC-SIS in most models, which indicates the robustness of MC-SIS towards heavy-tailed distributions.

Example 4. *In this example, we consider a real data set that contains the expression levels of 6319 genes and the expression levels of a G protein-coupled receptor (Ro1) in 30 mice (Segal et al., 2003). The same data set has been analyzed in Hall and Miller (2009) and in Li et al. (2012) using DC-SIS. The goal is to identify the most influential genes for Ro1.*

We apply SIS, NIS, DC-SIS, ACE-based MC-SIS and B-spline-based MC-SIS to select the top two most important genes, separately. Additionally, we note that almost all

Table 4: Top ranked genes for Example 4

	SIS	NIS	DC-SIS	MC-SIS (ACE)	MC-SIS (B-spline)
Rank 1 gene	Msa.2877.0	Msa.2877.0	Msa.2134.0	Msa.8081.0	Msa.2437.0
Rank 2 gene	Msa.964.0	Msa.1160.0	Msa.2877.0	Msa.2437.0	Msa.26751.0

Table 5: Adjusted R^2 (in percentage) of fitting 3 different models for Example 4

	SIS		NIS		DC-SIS		MC-SIS (ACE)		MC-SIS (B-spline)	
Model	top 1	top 2	top 1	top 2	top 1	top 2	top 1	top 2	top 1	top 2
Linear	74.5	82.3	74.5	75.8	58.4	77.6	13.8	16.9	12.7	40.5
Additive	80.0	84.2	80.0	84.5	65.7	96.8	58.9	68.7	68.5	68.8
Transformation	84.5	88.1	84.5	88.0	90.0	94.7	94.1	96.9	94.1	96.2

of the procedures considered here, including B-spline-based MC-SIS, consistently ranked *Msa.741.0*, *Msa.2134.0* and *Msa.2877.0* among the top ranked genes. The top-ranked two genes by individual procedures are reported in Table 4.

To further compare the performances of the screening procedures, we fit regression models for the response, which is the expression level of Ro1, using the top two genes selected by the procedures. Three different models are considered, which are the linear regression model $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$, the additive model $Y = \ell_1(X_1) + \ell_2(X_2) + \varepsilon$, and the optimal transformation model $\theta^*(Y) = \phi_1^*(X_1) + \phi_2^*(X_2) + \varepsilon$, where θ^*, ϕ_1^* and ϕ_2^* are the optimal transformations (Breiman and Friedman, 1985). For each procedure, all three models are fitted using the top ranked gene as well as using the top ranked two genes, and the resulting adjusted R^2 values are reported in Table 5.

Under the linear model, as expected, SIS achieves the largest adjusted R^2 values, whereas the adjusted R^2 values of ACE-based MC-SIS are rather poor. The major cause for the difference between SIS and ACE-based MC-SIS is that the former is specifically developed for screening under the linear model, whereas the latter is for screening under

the optimal transformation model. Under the additive model, when the top one gene is used, NIS achieves the largest adjusted R^2 value; and when the top two genes are used, DC-SIS achieves the largest adjusted R^2 value. Under the optimal transformation model, MC-SIS (both ACE-based and B-spline-based) methods achieve the largest adjusted R^2 values with both the top one gene and top two genes. When plotting the expression levels of Ro1 against the expression levels of various selected genes, different patterns including linear and nonlinear patterns emerge for different screening methods. In practice, we believe that the top ranked genes by different methods are all worth further investigation.

5 Discussion

The performances and results of B-spline-based MC-SIS depend on the choice of degree and the number of knots for B-splines. In this paper, we have developed a data-driven three-step procedure to construct B-spline basis functions for MC-SIS in practice. The proposed procedure demonstrates satisfactory performance in simulation study as well as real data application. We hope to investigate and characterize the theoretical property of the procedure in the future.

Similar to other existing screening procedures, MC-SIS fail to retain active predictor variables that are marginally independent with the response variable. Under the linear regression model, Fan and Lv (2008) proposed an iterative procedure to recover such predictor variables. Similarly, we have developed an iterative version of MC-SIS with the hope to recover active predictor variables missed by MC-SIS. Currently, we are investigating the empirical performance and theoretical property of this iterative version and hope to report the results in a future publication.

Most existing marginal screening procedures under nonparametric model assumptions, including MC-SIS, make use of independent measures, whose estimation typically involves

nonparametric model fitting and tuning parameter selection. Nonparametric methods are known to be sensitive to tuning parameter selection. Therefore, this can also become a drawback for those screening procedures. On the other hand, there are various independence measures that are based on cumulative distribution functions, and the estimation of those measures does not involve nonparametric fitting and tuning parameter selection. Two examples include Hoeffding's test (Hoeffding, 1948) and Heller-Heller-Gorfine tests (Heller et al., 2012). It will be of interest to explore the application of these measures for screening and the potential of using these methods for variable selection after screening.

Appendix

A Proofs

A.1 Notation

n : sample size

p : dimension size

ℓ : degree of polynomial spline

k : number of knots

d_n : dimension of B-spline basis

$\mathcal{D}$: active set

$\mathcal{I}$: inactive set

θ_j : transformation of response Y for pair (X_j, Y), $j = 1, 2, \ldots, p$

ϕ_j : transformation of X_j for pair (X_j, Y)

ρ_j : Pearson correlation of pair (X_j, Y)

e_j^2 : squared error by regressing ϕ_j on ρ_j

θ_j^* : optimal transformation of response Y for pair (X_j, Y)

ϕ_j^* : transformation of X_j for pair (X_j, Y)

ρ_j^* : maximum correlation of pair (X_j, Y)

e_j^{*2} : squared error by regressing ϕ_j^* on θ_j^*

θ_{nj}^* : spline approximation to optimal transformation θ_j^*

ϕ_{nj}^* : spline approximation to optimal transformation ϕ_j^*

s : cardinality of active set $\mathcal{D}$

$||\cdot||$: operator norm

$||\cdot||_{sup}$: sup norm

A.2 Bernstein's inequality and four facts

Lemma 2. *(Bernstein's inequality, Lemma 2.2.9, Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996)) For independent random variables $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ with bounded ranges $[-M, M]$ and 0 means,*

$$P\left(|Y_1 + \ldots + Y_n| > x\right) \leq 2\exp[-x^2/\{2(v + Mx/3)\}]$$

for $v \geq var(Y_1 + \ldots + Y_n)$.

Under conditions (C3) and (C4), the following four facts hold when $\ell \geq d$.

Fact 1. There exists a positive constant C_1 such that (Burman, 1991)

$$E\{(\phi_j^* - \phi_{nj}^*)^2\} \leq C_1 k^{-d} \tag{12}$$

Fact 2. There exists a positive constant C_2 such that (Stone et al., 1985; Huang et al., 2010)

$$E\{B_{jm}^2(\cdot)\} \leq C_2 d_n^{-1} \tag{13}$$

Fact 3. There exist positive constants c_{11}, c_{12} such that (Burman, 1991; Zhou et al.,

1998)

$$\begin{aligned} c_{11}d_n^{-1} \leq \lambda_{min}\left(E\{\mathbf{B}_j(\cdot)\mathbf{B}_j^T(\cdot)\}\right) \leq \lambda_{max}\left(E\{\mathbf{B}_j(\cdot)\mathbf{B}_j^T(\cdot)\}\right) \leq c_{12}d_n^{-1} \\ c_{11}k^{-1} \leq \lambda_{min}\left(E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}\right) \leq \lambda_{max}\left(E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j)\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T(X_j)\}\right) \leq c_{12}k^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Fact 4. There exists a positive constant C_3 such that (Burman, 1991; Faouzi et al., 1999)

$$C_3k^{-1} \leq b_{jm} \leq 1, \qquad 0 \leq \widehat{b_{jm}} \leq 1 \tag{15}$$

Remark 1. *The choice of knots plays a role in establishing the sure screening property. When the knots of the B-splines are placed at the sample quantiles, $\widehat{b_{jm}}$ is positive. When knots are uniform placed, $\widehat{b_{jm}}$ can be zero with a small probability. According to Burman (1991, section 6a), when the marginal density $f_{X_j}(x) > \gamma_0 > 0$ by condition (C4) for each X_j, we have $P(\widehat{b_{jm}} = 0$ for some $m = 1, \ldots, d_n) \leq k\exp(-\gamma_0 n/k)$. The results in Burman (1991) are based on equally spaced knots, and our proof for MC-SIS use the same choice of knots, as the probability of $\widehat{b_{jm}}$ being zero is a small probability, we just acknowledge $\widehat{b_{jm}} > 0$ in the proof. In fact, sure screening property still hold when the event $\widehat{b_{jm}} = 0$ is included.*

Remark 2. *With ℓ fixed, k and d_n are of the same order, we replace k with d_n in the following proof for convenience.*

A.3 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$E(\phi_j^{*2}) \leq 2E\{(\phi_j^* - \phi_{nj}^*)^2\} + 2E(\phi_{nj}^{*2})$$

Therefore,

$$E(\phi_{nj}^{*2}) \geq \frac{1}{2}E(\phi_j^{*2}) - E\{(\phi_j^* - \phi_{nj}^*)^2\}$$

Lemma 1 follows from condition (C5) together with $E(\phi_{nj}^{*2}) = \lambda_{j1}^*$. □

A.4 Proof of eight basic results

We list and prove eight results (R1) – (R8) which together form the major parts in proving sure screening property of MC-SIS. For the rest of the paper, we use P_n to denote the sample average.

R1. With c_{11} in *Fact 3*, we have that,

$$||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}|| \leq c_{11}^{-1/2} d_n^{1/2} \tag{16}$$

Proof. $||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}|| = \lambda_{min}^{-1/2}(\mathbf{A}_{j00})$, result follows by *Fact 3*. □

R2. There exist positive constant c_{13} such that

$$||\mathbf{A}_{j0X}|| \leq c_{13} d_n^{-1/2} \tag{17}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_{d_n})^T \in R^{d_n}$ with $\sum_{m=1}^{d_n} u_m^2 = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}^T E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\mathbf{u} &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_n}\left[\int\{\sum_{m=1}^{d_n} u_m B_{jm}(X_j)\}B_{ji}(Y)dF\right]^2 \\
&\leq \int\{\sum_{m=1}^{d_n} u_m B_{jm}(X_j)\}^2 dF \times \sum_{i=1}^{d_n}\{\int B_{ji}^2(Y)dF\} \\
&\leq \lambda_{max}[E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}] \times d_n \max_i E\{B_{ji}^2(Y)\}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, $||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \leq (c_{12}C_2/d_n)^{1/2}$ by *Fact 2* and *Fact 3*.

It can be easily shown that, for $\mathbf{u} \in R^{d_n-1}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i^2 = 1$,

$$\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{D}_j \mathbf{D}_j^T \mathbf{u} = \sum_{m=1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{k^2 b_{jm}^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i z_{im} \right)^2 \leq C_3^{-2} \sum_{m=1}^{d_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i z_{im} \right)^2 \leq C_3^{-2}$$

which indicates $||\mathbf{D}_j^T|| \leq C_3^{-1}$.

Then, $||\mathbf{A}_{j0X}|| \leq ||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\mathbf{D}_j^T|| \leq c_{13} d_n^{-1/2}$ with $c_{13} = (c_{12}C_2)^{1/2} C_3^{-1}$.

□

R3. For any given constant c_4, there exists a positive constant c_8 such that

$$P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}|| \geq \left((c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1} d_n\right)^{1/2}\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) \tag{18}$$

Proof. Since $||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}|| = \sqrt{|||[P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}]^{-1}||}$. R3 can be obtained via equation (26) in Fan et al. (2011), which is $P\{|||[P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}]^{-1}|| \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1} d_n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3})$. □

R4. There exist some positive constants c_6, c_7 such that,

$$P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}|| \geq c_6 d_n^{-1/2}\} \leq 4d_n^2 \exp(-c_7 n d_n^{-2}) \tag{19}$$

Proof. As $||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}|| = ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T|| \leq ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T||$, we firstly deal with $||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||$.

For any square matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, $||\mathbf{A}+\mathbf{B}|| \leq ||\mathbf{A}|| + ||\mathbf{B}||$. We have

$$||\mathbf{A}|| - ||\mathbf{B}|| \leq ||\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{B}|| \qquad \text{and} \qquad ||\mathbf{B}|| - ||\mathbf{A}|| \leq ||\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{A}||$$

Then,

$$|\ ||\mathbf{A}|| - ||\mathbf{B}||\ | \leq ||\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{B}||$$

Let $\mathbf{V}_j = P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\} - E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}$. It follows that,

$$| \, ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| - ||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \, | \leq ||\mathbf{V}_j||$$

It is easy to verify that,

$$| \, ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| - ||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \, | \leq d_n||\mathbf{V}_j||_{sup}$$

Since $||B_{jm}(\cdot)||_{sup} \leq 1$ and using *Fact 2*, we have

$$\text{var}(B_{jm_1}(Y)B_{jm_2}(X_j)) \leq E\{B_{jm_1}^2(Y)B_{jm_2}^2(X_j)\} \leq E\{B_{jm_1}^2(Y)\} \leq C_2 d_n^{-1}$$

By Bernstein's inequality, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$P\{|(P_n - E)\{B_{jm_1}(Y)B_{jm_2}(X_j)\}| \geq \delta/n\} \leq 2\exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} \qquad (20)$$

Therefore,

$$P\{| \, ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})||-||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \, | \geq d_n\delta/n\} \leq 2d_n^2\exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\}$$

Recalling R2, we have,

$$P\{||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \geq d_n\delta/n + (c_{12}C_2/d_n)^{1/2}\} \leq 2d_n^2\exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\}$$

By taking $\delta = c_8(c_{12}C_2)^{1/2}nd_n^{-3/2}$, we obtain that for some positive constant c_4,

$$P\{||(P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})|| \geq (c_8+1)(c_{12}C_2/d_n)^{1/2}\} \leq 2d_n^2\exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-2}) \qquad (21)$$

Next we deal with $||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T||$. Using Bernstein's inequality, we obtain that,

$$P\{|\widehat{b_{jm}} - b_{jm}| \geq \delta/n\} \leq 2\exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} \tag{22}$$

Since $b_{jm} \geq C_3 k^{-1}$, by taking $\delta = C_3 w_1 n d_n^{-1}$ for $w_1 \in (0,1)$, we have that there exists some positive constant c_5 such that

$$P\{\widehat{b_{jm}} \leq C_3(1-w_1)d_n^{-1}\} \leq 2\exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1}) \tag{23}$$

For $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_{d_n-1})^T \in R^{d_n-1}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i^2 = 1$,

$$\mathbf{u}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}_j} \widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T \mathbf{u} = \sum_{m=1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{k^2 \widehat{b_{jm}}^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i z_{im} \right)^2 \leq \max_m \frac{1}{k^2 \widehat{b_{jm}}^2} \tag{24}$$

Combing (22), (23) and (24), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T|| \geq C_3^{-1}(1-w_1)^{-1}\} &\leq P\{\max_m \frac{1}{k\widehat{b_{jm}}} \geq C_3^{-1}(1-w_1)^{-1}\} \\ &\leq P\{\min_m \widehat{b_{jm}} \leq C_3(1-w_1)k^{-1}\} \\ &\leq 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Combining (21), (25), and $||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}|| \leq ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T||$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}|| \geq (c_8+1)(c_{12}C_2)^{1/2} d_n^{-1/2} C_3^{-1}(1-w_1)^{-1}\} \\ &\leq P\{||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \geq (c_8+1)(c_{12}C_2)^{1/2} d_n^{-1/2}\} + P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T|| \geq C_3^{-1}(1-w_1)^{-1}\} \\ &\leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-2}) + 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Result in R4 follows by choosing c_6, c_7 accordingly. □

R5. There exist some positive constants c_9, c_{10} such that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}} - \mathbf{A}_{j0X}|| \geq c_9 d_n^2 \delta^2/n^2 + c_{10} d_n \delta/n\} \\ \leq 8d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 4d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Proof. It is easy to derive

$$\begin{aligned} &||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}} - \mathbf{A}_{j0X}|| = ||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T - E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\mathbf{D}_j{}^T|| \\ &\leq ||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T - \mathbf{D}_j^T|| + ||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T - \mathbf{D}_j^T|| \\ &\qquad + ||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\mathbf{D}_j{}^T|| \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

It is proved in R2 that $||E\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \leq (c_{12}C_2/d_n)^{1/2}$ and that $||\mathbf{D}_j{}^T|| \leq C_3^{-1}$. Combining (20) and the fact that

$$||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \leq d_n||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||_{sup},$$

we have that,

$$P\{||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \geq d_n\delta/n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\}. \tag{29}$$

For $\mathbf{u} \in R^{d_n - 1}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i^2 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^T(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j} - \mathbf{D}_j)(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j} - \mathbf{D}_j)^T\mathbf{u} &= \sum_{m=1}^{d_n} \left(\frac{1}{k\widehat{b_{jm}}} - \frac{1}{kb_{jm}}\right)^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_n-1} u_i z_{im}\right)^2 \\ &\leq C_3^{-2} \max_m \frac{(\widehat{b_{jm}} - b_{jm})^2}{\widehat{b_{jm}}^2} \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

From (22), (23) and (30), we have that,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T - \mathbf{D}_j^T|| \geq C_3^{-2}(1-w_1)^{-1}d_n\delta/n\} \\
&\leq P\{C_3^{-1}\max_m \frac{|\widehat{b_{jm}} - b_{jm}|}{\widehat{b_{jm}}} \geq C_3^{-1}\frac{\delta/n}{C_3(1-w_1)d_n^{-1}}\} \\
&\leq P\{\max_m |\widehat{b_{jm}} - b_{jm}| \geq \delta/n\} + P\{\min_m \widehat{b_{jm}} \leq C_3(1-w_1)d_n^{-1}\} \\
&\leq 2d_n \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned}
\tag{31}
$$

Therefore, together with (28), (29), (31) and union bound of probability, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}} - \mathbf{A}_{j0X}|| \geq \frac{d_n^2\delta^2/n^2}{C_3^2(1-w_1)} + \frac{(c_{12}C_2)^{1/2}d_n^{1/2}\delta/n}{C_3^2(1-w_1)} + C_3^{-1}d_n\delta/n\} \\
&\leq 4d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 4d_n \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 4d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned}
$$

Result in R5 can be obtained by adjusting the values of c_9 and c_{10}. □

R6. For given c_4 and c_5, there exist positive constants c_{15} and c_{16} such that,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}|| \geq c_{16}d_n\} \\
&\quad \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) + 2d_n^3 \exp(-c_{15} n d_n^{-7}) + 2d_n^3 \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned}
\tag{32}
$$

Proof. Follow the proof in Lemma 5 of Fan et al. (2011), we have that,

$$
|\lambda_{min}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) - \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)| \leq d_n||\mathbf{V}_j||_{sup}, \text{ where } \mathbf{V}_j = \widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T - \mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T
$$

The (s,m)-entry of $\mathbf{V}_j$ is

$$(\mathbf{V}_j)^{(s,m)} = |\sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \frac{z_{si}z_{mi}}{k^2}\left(\frac{1}{\widehat{b_{ji}^2}} - \frac{1}{b_{ji}^2}\right)| = |\sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \frac{z_{si}z_{mi}}{k^2 b_{ji}^2}\left(\frac{b_{ji}^2 - \widehat{b_{ji}^2}}{\widehat{b_{ji}^2}}\right)|$$
$$\leq C_3^{-2} d_n \max_i |\frac{b_{ji}^2 - \widehat{b_{ji}^2}}{\widehat{b_{ji}^2}}| \leq 2C_3^{-2} d_n \max_i |\frac{b_{ji} - \widehat{b_{ji}}}{\widehat{b_{ji}^2}}|$$

It is clear that $||\mathbf{V}_j||_{sup} \leq 2C_3^{-2} d_n \max_i |(b_{ji} - \widehat{b_{ji}})/\widehat{b_{ji}^2}|$. Together with (22) and (23) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\{|\lambda_{min}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) - \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)| \geq 2C_3^{-4}(1-w_1)^{-2}d_n^4\delta/n\} \\
&\leq P\{2C_3^{-2}d_n^2 \max_i |\frac{b_{ji} - \widehat{b_{ji}}}{\widehat{b_{ji}^2}}| \geq 2C_3^{-2}d_n^2\delta/n \times C_3^{-2}(1-w_1)^{-2}d_n^2\} \\
&\leq P\{\max_m |\widehat{b_{jm}} - b_{jm}| \geq \delta/n\} + P\{\min_m \widehat{b_{jm}} \leq C_3(1-w_1)d_n^{-1}\} \\
&\leq 2d_n \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

which indicates that there exists a positive constant c_{14},

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\{|\lambda_{min}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) - \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)| \geq c_{14}d_n^4\delta/n\} \\
&\qquad \leq 2d_n \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Due to the facts that

$$c_{11}k^{-1} \leq \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq$$
$$\lambda_{max}(E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})\lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq c_{12}k^{-1}\lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)$$

and that

$$c_{11}k^{-1}\lambda_{max}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq \lambda_{min}(E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})\lambda_{max}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq \lambda_{max}(\mathbf{D}_j E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq c_{12}k^{-1}$$

we have

$$\frac{c_{11}}{c_{12}} \leq \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq \lambda_{max}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T) \leq \frac{c_{12}}{c_{11}}$$

By taking $\delta = w_2/c_{14}nd_n^{-4} \times c_{11}/c_{12}$ in (33) for any $w_2 \in (0,1)$, there exists a positive constant c_{15} such that,

$$P\{|\lambda_{min}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) - \lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)| \geq w_2\lambda_{min}(\mathbf{D}_j\mathbf{D}_j^T)\} \leq 2d_n\exp(-c_{15}nd_n^{-7}) + 2d_n\exp(-c_5nd_n^{-1})$$

By following a similar argument in proving inequality (26) in NIS (Fan et al., 2011), we have,

$$P\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) \geq (c_8+1)c_{12}/c_{11}\} \leq 2d_n\exp(-c_{15}nd_n^{-7}) + 2d_n\exp(-c_5nd_n^{-1}) \quad (34)$$

Similarly, it is easy to obtain

$$P\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}) \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1}d_n\} \leq 2d_n^2\exp(-c_4nd_n^{-3}) \quad (35)$$

Due to the fact that $\lambda_{max}(\mathbf{H}^{-1}) = \lambda_{min}^{-1}(\mathbf{H})$, we have

$$||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}|| = \lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}) \leq \lambda_{min}^{-1}(P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})\ \lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T)$$

Together with (34) and (35), we can obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}|| \geq (c_8+1)^2 c_{12} c_{11}^{-2} d_n\} \\
&\leq P\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\})\ \lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) \geq (c_8+1)^2 c_{12} c_{11}^{-2} d_n\} \\
&\leq P\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}) \geq (c_8+1)c_{12}/c_{11}\} + P\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}\widehat{\mathbf{D}_j}^T) \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1} d_n\} \\
&\leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) + 2d_n \exp(-c_{15} n d_n^{-7}) + 2d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1})
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, R6 follows by choosing $c_{16} = (c_8+1)^2 c_{12} c_{11}^{-2}$. □

R7. For any $\delta > 0$, given positive constant c_4, there exists a positive constant c_{17} such that,

$$
P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}|| \geq c_{17} d_n^{5/2}\delta/n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) + 2d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} \tag{36}
$$

Proof. Using perturbation theory (Katō, 1995), it is proved (Burman, 1991, *Lemma 6.3*) that for some $c_{18} > 0$,

$$
||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}|| \leq c_{18}\tilde{\gamma}^{-3/2}||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}|| \tag{37}
$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the minimum of the smallest eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{j00}$. $\tilde{\gamma}$ is positive by definition. Therefore,

$$
\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} = \max\{\lambda_{min}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}), \lambda_{min}^{-1}(\mathbf{A}_{j00})\} = \max\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1}||, ||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1}||\}
$$

From *Fact 3* and R3, we have,

$$c_{12}^{-1} d_n \leq ||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1}|| \leq c_{11}^{-1} d_n \tag{38a}$$

$$P\{|||[P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}]^{-1}|| \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1}d_n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) \tag{38b}$$

Combining (38a) and (38b) yields

$$P\{\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \geq \max\left((c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1}d_n, c_{11}^{-1}d_n\right)\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3})$$

which is,

$$P\{\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1}d_n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) \tag{39}$$

Additionally, as proved in equation (33) in Fan et al. (2011), we have large deviation bound for $||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}||$,

$$P\{||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(Y)\mathbf{B}_j^T(Y)\}|| \geq d_n\delta/n\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} \tag{40}$$

By (37), (39), (40) and under the union bound of probability, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}|| \geq c_{18}(c_8+1)^{3/2}c_{11}^{-3/2}d_n^{5/2}\delta/n\} \\
&\leq P\{c_{18}\tilde{\gamma}^{-3/2}||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}|| \geq c_{18}(c_8+1)^{3/2}c_{11}^{-3/2}d_n^{3/2}\ d_n\delta/n\} \\
&\leq P\{\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \geq (c_8+1)c_{11}^{-1}d_n\} + P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}} - \mathbf{A}_{j00}|| \geq d_n\delta/n\} \\
&\leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) + 2d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Therefore, R7 follows by choosing $c_{17} = c_{18}(c_8+1)^{3/2}c_{11}^{-3/2}$. □

R8. For any $\delta > 0$, given positive constant c_4, there exist a positive constant c_{19} such that,

$$P\{||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}|| \geq c_{19}(d_n^5\delta^3/n^3 + d_n^3\delta/n)\} \leq 8d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} + 4d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) + 2d_n \exp(-c_{15} n d_n^{-7}) + 6d_n \exp(-c_5 n d_n^{-1}) \tag{42}$$

Proof. It's obvious that

$$||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}|| \leq ||\mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}||\ ||\mathbf{A}_{jXX} - \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}|| \tag{43}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} &||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}} - \mathbf{A}_{jXX}|| = ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j^T - \mathbf{D}_j E\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}\mathbf{D}_j^T|| \\ &\leq ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j - \mathbf{D}_j||\ ||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j^T - \mathbf{D}_j^T|| + 2||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\times \\ &\quad ||\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_j^T - \mathbf{D}_j^T|| + ||\mathbf{D}_j^T||\ ||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}||\ ||\mathbf{D}_j|| \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

From the similar reasoning in proving (21) and (29), it is easy to obtain that

$$P\{||P_n\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \geq (c_8 + 1)c_{13}d_n^{-1}\} \leq 2d_n^2 \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-3}) \tag{45}$$

$$P\left(||(P_n - E)\{\mathbf{B}_j(X_j)\mathbf{B}_j^T(X_j)\}|| \geq d_n\delta/n\right) \leq 2d_n^2 \exp\{-\frac{\delta^2}{2(C_2 n d_n^{-1} + 2\delta/3)}\} \tag{46}$$

With c_{19} chosen properly, results in R8 follows by combining *Fact 3*, (31), (32), (43), (44), (45), (46) and the fact $||\mathbf{D}_j^T|| < C_3^{-1}$. □

A.5 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. Recall that

$$\lambda_{j1}^{*} = ||\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}\mathbf{A}_{j0X}\mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{jX0}\mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}||$$

and that

$$\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^{*}} = ||\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}^{T}\widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}||$$

Let $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{A}_{j00}^{-1/2}$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A}_{j0X}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{A}_{jXX}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{a_n} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j00}}^{-1/2}$, $\mathbf{b_n} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{j0X}}$, $\mathbf{H_n} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}_{jXX}}^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^{*}} - \lambda_{j1}^{*} = ||\mathbf{a_n}^T\mathbf{b_n}^T\mathbf{H_n}\mathbf{b_n}\mathbf{a_n}|| - ||\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{H}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{a}|| \\
&\leq ||(\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a})^T\mathbf{b}_n^T\mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{b}_n(\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a})|| + 2||(\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a})^T\mathbf{b}_n^T\mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{b}_n\mathbf{a}|| + ||\mathbf{a}^T(\mathbf{b}_n^T\mathbf{H}_n\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b}^T\mathbf{H}\mathbf{b})\mathbf{a}|| \\
&\quad \triangleq S_1 + S_2 + S_3
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

We denote the terms in r.h.s as S_1, S_2 and S_3 respectively. Furthermore, we let the r.h.s of inequalities (19),(27),(32),(36),(42) as Q_4, Q_5, Q_6, Q_7, Q_8.

Note that

$$S_1 \leq ||\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a}||^2\ ||\mathbf{b}_n||^2\ ||\mathbf{H}_n|| \tag{48}$$

By (19),(32),(36), we have that there exist a positive constant c_{20} such that,

$$P\{S_1 \geq c_{20}d_n^5\delta^2/n^2\} \leq Q_4 + Q_6 + Q_7 \tag{49}$$

As to S_2,

$$S_2 \leq ||\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a}||\ ||\mathbf{b}_n||^2\ ||\mathbf{H}_n||\ ||\mathbf{a}|| \tag{50}$$

By (16),(19),(32),(36), we have that there exist a positive constant c_{21} such that,

$$P\{S_2 \geq c_{21} d_n^3 \delta/n\} \leq Q_4 + Q_6 + Q_7 \tag{51}$$

As to S_3,

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &\leq ||\mathbf{a}||^2 \, ||\mathbf{b}_n^T \mathbf{H}_n B_n - \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{H} \mathbf{b}|| \\ &\leq ||\mathbf{a}||^2 (||(\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b})^T \mathbf{H}_n (\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b})|| + 2||(\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b})^T \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{b}|| + ||\mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{H}_n - \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{b}||) \\ &\triangleq ||\mathbf{a}||^2 (S_{31} + 2S_{32} + S_{33}) \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Note that

$$S_{31} \leq ||\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b}||^2 \, ||\mathbf{H}_n|| \tag{53}$$

By (27),(32), we have that there exist a positive constant c_{22} such that,

$$P\{S_{31} \geq c_{22} d_n^5 (\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n)^2\} \leq Q_5 + Q_6 \tag{54}$$

As to S_{32},

$$S_{32} \leq ||\mathbf{b}_n - \mathbf{b}|| \, ||\mathbf{H}_n|| \, ||\mathbf{b}|| \tag{55}$$

By (17),(27),(32),(36), we have that there exist a positive constant c_{23} such that,

$$P\{S_{32} \geq c_{23} d_n^{5/2} (\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n)\} \leq Q_5 + Q_6 \tag{56}$$

As to S_{33},

$$S_{33} \leq ||\mathbf{b}||^2 \, ||\mathbf{H}_n - \mathbf{H}|| \tag{57}$$

By (17),(42), we have that there exist a positive constant c_{24} such that,

$$P\{S_{33} \geq c_{24}(d_n^4\delta^3/n^3 + d_n^2\delta/n)\} \leq Q_8 \tag{58}$$

Combining (16),(52),(53),(55),(57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\{S_3 \geq c_{22}d_n^6(\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n)^2 + c_{23}d_n^{7/2}(\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n) + c_{24}(d_n^5\delta^3/n^3 + d_n^3\delta/n)\} \\ \leq 2Q_5 + 2Q_6 + Q_8 \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Define $\varsigma(d_n, \delta) = c_{20}d_n^5\delta^2/n^2 + c_{21}d_n^3\delta/n + c_{22}d_n^6(\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n)^2 + c_{23}d_n^{7/2}(\delta^2/n^2 + \delta/n) + c_{24}(d_n^5\delta^3/n^3 + d_n^3\delta/n)$. Then from (47),(49),(51),(59), we have that due to symmetry,

$$P\{|\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} - \lambda_{j1}^*| \geq \varsigma(d_n, \delta)\} \leq 4Q_4 + 4Q_5 + 8Q_6 + 4Q_7 + 2Q_8 \tag{60}$$

By properly choosing the value of δ (i.e., taking $\delta = c_2(c_{22} + c_{23})^{-1}d_n^{-5/2}n^{1-2\kappa}$), we can make $\varsigma(d_n, \delta) = c_2 d_n n^{-2\kappa}$, for any $c_2 > 0$. Then, we have

$$P(|\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} - \lambda_{j1}^*| \geq c_2 d_n n^{-2\kappa}) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(d_n^2 \exp(-c_3 n^{1-4\kappa} d_n^{-4}) + d_n \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-7})\right) \tag{61}$$

The first part of Theorem 1 follows via the union bound of probability.

To prove the second part, we define a event

$$\mathcal{A}_n \equiv \{\underset{j\in\mathcal{D}}{max}\, |\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} - \lambda_{j1}^*| \leq c_1\xi d_n n^{-2\kappa}/2\}$$

By Lemma 1, we have

$$\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} \geq c_1\xi d_n n^{-2\kappa}/2, \forall j \in \mathcal{D} \tag{62}$$

Thus, by choosing $\nu_n = c_5 d_n n^{-2\kappa}$ with $c_5 \leq c_1\xi/2$. We have that $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{D}_{\nu_n}}$. Therefore,

$$P(\mathcal{A}_n^c) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(s\{d_n^2 \exp\{-c_3 n^{1-4\kappa} d_n^{-4}\} + d_n \exp(-c_4 n d_n^{-7})\}\right)$$

Then the probability bound for the second part of Theorem 1 is attained.

A.6 Proof sketch of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. From subsection 2.2, we have that $\lambda_{j1}^* = E(\phi_{nj}^{*2})$ and $\widehat{\lambda_{j1}^*} = P_n(\phi_{nj}^{*2})$.

From equation (5), after obtaining θ_{nj}^* where Var$(\theta_{nj}^*) = 1$, ϕ_{nj}^* can be obtained via the following optimization problem.

$$\underset{\phi_{nj} \in \mathcal{S}_n}{\arg\min} \quad E[\{\theta_{nj}^*(Y) - \phi_{nj}(X_j)\}^2], \text{ where } \phi_{nj}(X_j) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_j^T \boldsymbol{\psi}_j(X_j).$$

Therefore, $\phi_{nj}^* = \boldsymbol{\psi}_j^T E\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \boldsymbol{\psi}_j{}^T\}^{-1} E\boldsymbol{\psi}_j \theta_{nj}^*$.

We notice that the only difference between our proof and the proof of Theorem 2 in Fan et al. (2011) is the role of Y. As MC-SIS essentially uses transformation of Y, we can not deal directly with Y. However, from the formulation above, θ_{nj}^* here plays the same role as Y in Fan et al. (2011). With this connection, our proof follows immediately by replacing Y in the proof of Theorem 2 in Fan et al. (2011) with θ_{nj}^*.

References

Bickel, P. J. and Xu, Y. (2009). Discussion of: Brownian distance covariance. The Annals of Applied Statistics, 3(4):1266–1269.

Breiman, L. and Friedman, J. H. (1985). Estimating optimal transformations for multiple-regression and correlation. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 80(391):580–598.

Bryc, W. and Dembo, A. (2005). On the maximum correlation coefficient. Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 49(1):132–138.

Burman, P. (1991). Rates of convergence for the estimates of the optimal transformations of variables. Annals of Statistics, 19(2):702–723.

Dembo, A., Kagan, A., and Shepp, L. A. (2001). Remarks on the maximum correlation coefficient. Bernoulli, 7(2):343–350.

Fan, J., Feng, Y., and Song, R. (2011). Nonparametric independence screening in sparse ultra-high-dimensional additive models. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 106(494):544–557.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 96(456):1348–1360.

Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 70(5):849–911.

Fan, J., Ma, Y., and Dai, W. (2014). Nonparametric independence screening in sparse ultra-high dimensional varying coefficient models. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 109(507):1270–1284.

Fan, J., Samworth, R., and Wu, Y. (2009). Ultrahigh dimensional feature selection: beyond the linear model. The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 10:2013–2038.

Fan, J. and Song, R. (2010). Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with np-dimensionality. Annals of Statistics, 38(6):3567–3604.

Faouzi, E., Eddin, N., et al. (1999). Rates of convergence for spline estimates of additive principal components. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 68(1):120–137.

Gebelein, H. (1941). Das statistische problem der korrelation als variations-und eigenwertproblem und sein zusammenhang mit der ausgleichsrechnung. Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik, 21(6):364–379.

Hall, P. and Miller, H. (2009). Using generalized correlation to effect variable selection in very high dimensional problems. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 18(3):533–550.

Hall, P. and Miller, H. (2011). Determining and depicting relationships among components in high-dimensional variable selection. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 20(4):988–1006.

Hastie, T., Friedman, J., and Tibshirani, R. (2009). The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction, Second Edition. Springer.

Heller, R., Heller, Y., and Gorfine, M. (2012). A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances. Biometrika, 100(2):503–510.

Hoeffding, W. (1948). A non-parametric test of independence. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 19:546–557.

Huang, J., Horowitz, J., and Wei, F. (2010). Variable selection in nonparametric additive models. Annals of Statistics, 38(4):2282–2313.

Kat$\bar{\text{o}}$, T. (1995). Perturbation theory for linear operators, volume 132. Springer Verlag.

Li, R., Zhong, W., and Zhu, L. (2012). Feature screening via distance correlation learning. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 107(499):1129–1139.

Rényi, A. (1959). On measures of dependence. Acta Mathematica Hungarica, 10(3):441–451.

Reshef, D. N., Reshef, Y. A., Finucane, H. K., Grossman, S. R., McVean, G., Turnbaugh, P. J., Lander, E. S., Mitzenmacher, M., and Sabeti, P. C. (2011). Detecting novel associations in large data sets. Science, 334(6062):1518–1524.

Segal, M. R., Dahlquist, K. D., and Conklin, B. R. (2003). Regression approaches for microarray data analysis. Journal of Computational Biology, 10(6):961–980.

Speed, T. (2011). A correlation for the 21st century. Science, 334(6062):1502–1503.

Stone, C. J. et al. (1985). Additive regression and other nonparametric models. Annals of Statistics, 13(2):689–705.

Szekely, G. and Mori, T. (1985). An extremal property of rectangular distributions. Statistics & probability letters, 3(2):107–109.

Szekely, G. J., Rizzo, M. L., and Bakirov, N. K. (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. Annals of Statistics, 35(6):2769–2794.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 58(1):267–288.

Van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics. Springer.

Yu, Y. (2008). On the maximal correlation coefficient. Statistics & Probability Letters, 78(9):1072–1075.

Zhou, S., Shen, X., and Wolfe, D. (1998). Local asymptotics for regression splines and confidence regions. Annals of Statistics, 26(5):1760–1782.

Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 67(2):301–320.